

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,890	02/27/2002	Georges Marcel Victor Thielen	DN2001057	8170
7590 08/09/2004		EXAMINER		
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company			LEE, F	RIP A
Patent & Trade	mark Department - D/82 set Street	3	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Akron, OH 44			1713	<u>, </u>

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/084,890	VICTOR THIELEN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	·
	Rip A. Lee	1713	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
eriod for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). tatus	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	April 2004.		
· <u> </u>	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	·	•	is
isposition of Claims			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and polication Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	•	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• •		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	. ,
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have beer eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
tachment(s)			
■ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) L Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/084,890

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

This office action follows a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 § C.F.R. 1.114, filed on April 30, 2004. The first office action for this application was sent on June 9, 2003. Applicants have now filed a petition for unintentionally delayed domestic claim of benefit to earlier filing date under 37 C.F.R. 1.78(a)(3). The petition was entered into the record on May 3, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 942 042 to Colvin *et al.* for the same reasons set forth in previous office actions.
- 4. Claims 1-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 942 042 to Colvin *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,614,580 to Zanzig et al. or U.S. Patent No. 5,674,932 to Agostini *et al.* for the same reasons set forth in previous office actions

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered fully, but they are not persuasive. Applicants offer the same arguments presented in previous responses, and examiner's response remains invariant. Therefore, these arguments need not be presented here.

Conclusion

- 6. To date, Applicant's petition has not been granted. As such, the claim rejections remain in force. Claims would be allowable over U.S. Patent No. 6,469,104 to Colvin *et al.* if the petition is granted.
- 7. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/084,890

Art Unit: 1713

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 4

examiner should be directed to Rip A. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-1104. The

examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be

reached at (571)272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on the access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

ral

August 5, 2004

DAVID W. WU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY OF WITER 1700